

who have willingly and courageously fought on our behalf.

Now we can build on those efforts by passing the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act. As the name implies, this legislation will enhance accountability measures at the VA and better enable the Department to remove—to remove—employees who are failing to meet the standards expected of them.

This bill, in conjunction with the continued administration efforts like those Secretary Shulkin announced yesterday, will further improve medical services offered to our veterans at VA facilities all across our country. It was unfortunate to see this legislation held up in a previous Congress, but I am proud that the Republican Senate has made its passage among our top priorities.

I once again recognize Veterans' Affairs Committee chairman JOHNNY ISAKSON and Senator RUBIO for the part they played in moving this very important bill forward and remaining vigilant on behalf of America's veterans. I know we are all eager to advance it today and send it on down to the White House for the President's signature.

NOMINATION OF COURTNEY ELWOOD

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, one final matter, today we will confirm Courtney Elwood, the nominee for general counsel at the Central Intelligence Agency. As Chairman BURR pointed out at her hearing, Ms. Elwood has an impressive legal background. She graduated from Yale Law School before clerking under Chief Justice William Rehnquist on the Supreme Court, and she served as a former advisor to both Vice President Cheney and President Bush, as well as to the Attorney General.

In her role at the CIA, Ms. Elwood will be providing sound legal advice to Director Pompeo, ensuring accountability at the Agency as a whole, and overseeing a number of priorities that are key to supporting our Nation's intelligence community. Her nomination has already earned bipartisan support. I am sure that once she is confirmed, she will serve our country well in this new role.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first I want to talk about infrastructure. This week, the administration is laying out a few "proposals" on infrastructure. So far, it has been a major disappointment. President Trump pitched a trillion-dollar infrastructure plan in his

campaign and continued to mention it in the days after the election. We Democrats welcomed the idea.

One of my first conversations with the President after he was elected was about infrastructure.

I said: You called for a trillion-dollar infrastructure program.

He said to me: At least that.

I said: Sounds good to me. Let's work on it.

We have made overtures to the White House saying we would be willing to work with the President on infrastructure. I said it to the President directly several times. Democrats have been pushing for new money for infrastructure for a very long time. We even put out our own proposal, a trillion-dollar infrastructure plan, hoping it would spark a discussion.

We Democrats continue to welcome a serious and constructive dialogue on this issue, but unfortunately the President continues to disappoint. We sent our plan several months ago, and we have heard nothing for those months. Now the President seems to be intent on pushing forward an infrastructure plan on his own, one with few details, that is mostly private sector driven—that means tolls—and with minimum investment, and that would ignore a huge section of our infrastructure. The President doesn't seem to be talking to anyone but a few people in his inner circle. Some of them are financiers. Of course, they have been financing private sector infrastructure for a long time, but that is not the way we have worked in America since Henry Clay, a former—not quite a Republican. We didn't have any then, but he was a Whig—the predecessor party—and he came up with this idea of internal improvements. I remind my dear friend, the majority leader, Mr. CLAY was from Kentucky.

Internal improvements were supposed to connect what was then the east coast with the far West—Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio—with roads over Appalachia, and ever since, we have had bipartisan support on the Federal Government building infrastructure and putting in the dollars for it but not from President Trump, at least thus far.

The President's plan is a recipe for Trump tolls from one end of America to the other. That is not what the American people are crying out for. They don't want more tolls. They want us to rebuild our crumbling water systems, bridges, schools, roads, broadband, not finance new tollroads.

Unfortunately, the President surrounds himself with bankers and financiers. These are folks who used to work at investment banks. They look at infrastructure as an investment to be made by corporations in the private sector, but infrastructure has never been a business investment.

Infrastructure has been something the government has invested in for decades and even centuries because the benefits of infrastructure have great—

what the economists call externalities. The benefits for having a good highway is not just for the people who use the highway, but if a factory locates nearby because it can get its goods there more frequently and quickly, that is a benefit. A road itself might not generate short-term profits, but a factory might locate nearby and bring jobs and economic vibrancy to an area. The private sector might not build high-speed internet all the way out to the house at the end of the road if there isn't a profit there, but our rural people are as entitled to high-speed internet as our people in urban areas and, I might add, there are large parts of my city, New York City, where that last mile isn't done because there are poorer residents and it is less profitable.

That is why there has always been the role of government to stimulate infrastructure investment, to provide support for necessary maintenance and construction which the private sector would ignore. To connect that house at the end of the road to high-speed internet so children living in it can learn, thrive, and benefit in a global economy benefits America, even if someone isn't making a huge profit immediately from the building of that broadband. It is the same with the highway, the same with the bridge, the same with water and sewer, the same with the school with internet.

The bottom line is, if the President wants to sit down with Democrats, of course we want to do it, but if he continues to take this path with a plan cooked up by Wall Street advisers, it will not succeed or it will result in such a small measure that it will not be effective.

Again, I say to the President—there is talk, I read in the newspapers—they want to do this by reconciliation, no Democratic votes, just 52 Republican votes in the Senate. The same problem they had with healthcare, the same problem they are having with tax reform, will repeat itself with infrastructure if you don't do it in a bipartisan way.

Our colleagues constantly remind us that ObamaCare didn't work because it was done by one party, but now they are letting Trump lead them to do the same thing on just about every major issue. It is a formula for failure President Trump is advocating. He hasn't been down here in Washington that long. It is up to our Republican colleagues to teach him that working in a bipartisan way is the only way you can really get things done.

So my view is, we need bipartisan ship, but the President might not get—just remember that many Republicans are very negative, initially at least, with a private sector-driven infrastructure bill because they represent rural areas.

Here is what a Republican Senator from Wyoming, Mr. BARRASSO—fine man—said: "Funding solutions that involve public-private partnerships do not work for rural areas."